

REMARKS

These Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed March 10, 2008. The Examiner is thanked for conducting an interview with the Applicant on Tuesday May 6, 2008 at 11:00 AM PST. The Examiner and the Applicant discussed U.S. patent nos.: 6,397,259 and 6, 300,947. With respect to U.S. patent no.: 6,397,259, Figure 12, the Examiner indicated that in as much as 1804 extracted a Figure he considered this to be equivalent to extracting a link.

Claims 16-25 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 16, 18 and 19 have been amended. The amendments to Claims 16, 18 and 19 were undertaken to more clearly identify what was claimed in the invention. Claims 26-29 have been added. Claims 26-29 are supported by the original claims and in the specification at least at page 8, lines 15-30 and page 9, lines 1-26 and by original Claims 16 and 18. Claims 16-29 remain for the Examiner's consideration.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 16-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,397,259 to Lincke et al. (hereinafter '259), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947 to Kanevsky et al. (hereinafter '947).

Claim 16

Amended Claim 16 includes the limitation 'extracting only the links from the content of the Web page, said extracting performed without receiving further input from a user' and 'providing only the links and defining names for viewing on the display'. Since '259 and '947 do not teach or suggest 'extracting only the links from the content of the

Web page, said extracting performed without receiving further input from a user’ and ‘providing only the links and defining names for viewing on the display’, they do not teach or suggest all limitations of amended Claim 16. MPEP 2143.03. Accordingly, amended Claim 16 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Teaching Away

Applicant respectfully submits that ‘947 teaches away from ‘extracting only the links from the content of the Web page, said extracting performed without receiving further input from a user’ and ‘providing only the links and defining names for viewing on the display’ Consider the statement the “links are displayed with text or pictures” (‘947, column 2, lines 7-8). By displaying the links with text or pictures the links are not displayed separately. In addition, ‘947 states “web pages may also be expanded (objects and links added)” (column 10, lines 49-50). Expanding or adding links to the Web pages is the opposite of extracting the links from the Web pages. Further, ‘947 states “[c]onversely, if a size of a screen or window does not allow display of all textual and icon information on a whole screen or window, the web page is mapped into hierarchically linked new smaller pages that fully fit the current display or window” (column 2, lines 8-12). The Applicant submits that reducing the page size is not analogous to ‘extracting only the links from the content of the Web page’. Unlike Applicant’s invention, the ‘947 “adaptation strategy employs variables that provide size of screen and/or window information associated with the visual display from which a call to a web site was initiated” (column 2, lines 16-19). Accordingly, rather than teaching or suggesting the limitations, ‘947 teaches away by displaying only a portion of the text or

pictures and/or presenting a portion of the web content depending on the type of display used.

Claim 17

The Applicant respectfully submits that ‘947 does not teach or suggest the limitation “determining if more than one of the links identifies a single destination, and if so providing only one of the links identifying the single destination to the display”. The Examiner cites to ‘947, column 10, lines 35-50. However, the Applicant can find no teaching or suggestion at this cite that determines ‘if more than one of the links identifies a single destination’, or for ‘providing only one of the links identifying the single destination’. The Examiner is respectfully reminded that “[i]n order to provide a complete application file history and to enhance the clarity of the prosecution history record, an examiner must provide clear explanations of all actions taken by the examiner during prosecution of an application” MPEP 707.07(f). Accordingly, Claim 17 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 18

The Applicant respectfully submits that ‘947 does not teach or suggest the limitation of amended Claim 18, ‘defining names for links identified by text in the Web page, wherein the names are summaries of the identifying text using only a portion of the identifying text’. Neither ‘259 nor ‘947 teach or suggest ‘defining names for links identified by text in the Web page, wherein the names are summaries of the identifying text using only a portion of the identifying text’. Since ‘259 and ‘947 do not teach or suggest this limitation they do not teach or suggest all limitations of amended Claim 18.

MPEP 2143.03. Accordingly, Claim 18 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 20

Claim 20 contains the limitation ‘defining names for links identified by non-text images in the Web page by using content of documents accessed using the links when no text is provided in the ALT tag for the image’. The Examiner directs the Applicant to ‘259 column 61, lines 25 et seq., Figure 1 and ’947 column 10, lines 35-50. The Table at ‘259 column 61, line 25 et seq. indicates “text to display in place of image”, where the text description is “URL of image”, column 61, lines 30-31. With respect to Figure 1, HTML Page 144 is reproduced in its entirety in the Wireless Application Example Query Response 107. Because the content in 107 was not reduced it cannot constitute a teaching or suggestion that links were named. Since, neither ‘259 nor ‘947 teach or suggest ‘defining names for links identified by non-text images’ and ‘using content of documents accessed using the links when no text is provided in the ALT tag for the image’, they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 20. MPEP 2143.03. Accordingly, Claim 20 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 22

Claim 22 contains the limitation ‘defining names for links identified by non-text images in the Web page by using identifications for the links obtained from offsite documents when no text is provided in the ALT tag for the image’. Since neither ‘259 nor ‘947 teach or suggest ‘defining names for links identified by non-text images’ and ‘using identifications for the links obtained from offsite documents’, they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 22. MPEP 2143.03. Accordingly, Claim 22 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 25

Claim 25 contains the limitation ‘accessing a second Web page data file identified by a second URL, wherein the Web page contains both content and links’. The Examiner directs the Applicant to ‘259 Figure 1 and ’947 column 10, lines 35-50. The Table at

‘259 column 61, line 25 et seq. indicates “text to display in place of image”, column 61, line 31. With respect to Figure 1, HTML Page 144 is reproduced in its entirety in the Wireless Application Example Query Response 107. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that a second Web page identified by a second URL is accessed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to identify what part of the cite to ‘947 is relevant. Neither ‘259 nor ‘947 teach or suggest accessing a second Web page data file identified by a second URL, wherein the Web page contains both content and links’ they do not teach or suggest all limitations of Claim 25. MPEP 2143.03. Accordingly, Claim 25 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claims 17-25

Claims 17-25 all directly or indirectly depend from independent Claim 16, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent Claim 16 and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 103(a) rejection.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully requested that all outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the required fee and any underpayment of fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 11, 2008

By: /Anthony G. Craig/
Anthony G. Craig
Reg. No. 50,342

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer Number 23910